

REMARKS

In response the above-identified Office Action, Claims 1-18 remain pending in the present application.

For the reasons set forth more fully below, Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are allowable. Consequently, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue of the present application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chandra et al. ("Chandra"). In making the rejections, the Examiner contends that:

Chandra et al. sets forth a database system (FIG. 3) containing message queues (FIG. 2). Multiple chosen functions are provided, such as ENQUEUE and DEQUEUE in order to control the messages in the message queue (See col. 12, lines 62-68; col. 13, lines 1-67; and col. 16, lines 18-30). The chosen functions are utilized and implemented by SQL statements (col. 12, lines 65-67).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections.

The present invention provides aspects for integrating messaging functionality into database operations. The aspects include providing one or more chosen functions from a messaging system in a database system. The one or more chosen functions from the database system are then utilized within structured query language statements to access the messaging system from the database system. See independent claims 1, 7, and 13.

The present invention utilizes the mechanisms provided by SQL to allow a database query to be formed that incorporates messaging function operations within an SQL statement. Following the SQL standard, these messaging functions may be used wherever a function is allowed in SQL. Applicant respectfully submits that Chandra fails to teach, show, or suggest the recited invention.

Chandra teaches the use of relational tables of a relational database to store queues, the queues being ordered lists of messages. FIG. 3 of Chandra illustrates the containment of a queue as a file 324 in the relational database system 304. Applicant fails to see anything to teach or suggest a messaging system being accessed from a database system by Chandra's arrangement. Rather, Applicant respectfully submits that Chandra teaches away from the accessing of a messaging system from a database system, since the database system itself contains the messages in Chandra and thus is the system to be accessed in order to gain access to the messages stored therein.

Without teaching or suggesting the accessing of a messaging system from the database system, Applicant further fails to see in Chandra any teaching or suggestion of providing one or more chosen functions from a messaging system in a database system. The functions of ENQUEUE and DEQUEUE cited by the Examiner are not chosen functions of a messaging system provided in a database system, but rather are operations of the database system itself to place a message or retrieve a message in the queue table stored as a file in the database system. Further, without teaching or suggesting the provision of the chosen function(s), there is nothing the teach or suggest utilization of the chosen function(s) from the database system within SQL statements. The functions of Chandra are not utilized within SQL statements, as shown by the pseudo-SQL examples in Applicant's specification, e.g., pages 9-10, but are separate SQL statements themselves (see Chandra's Table 3 for example).

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that integrating messaging functionality into database operations as recited in independent claims 1, 7, and 13 is allowable over the cited art of Chandra. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 are respective dependent claims of 1, 7, and 13, and therefore include the features of

claims 1, 7, or 13 while adding further features. Accordingly, claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 are also respectfully submitted as allowable for at least those reasons stated hereinabove with respect to claims 1, 7, and 13.

Further, with more particular regard to dependent claims 3, 9, and 15, claims 3, 9, and 15 each recite aspects of the chosen functions as user-defined functions. Included in the recitation of these claims is “a queue of the messaging system.” Applicant respectfully submits that this recitation further distinguishes the recited invention over the cited art of Chandra, which, as stated above, specifically teaches a queue being in the relational database system.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Applicants' attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

September 18, 2003
Date



Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 30,801
(650) 493-4540